IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 606 OF 2007

Dr. Sanjiv Rawal .... Petitioner

versus

The State of Maharashra & ors..... Respondent.

Mr. Rajendra Sorankar for the petitioner
Mr. S.K. Chaturvedi i/b. M/s. Chaturvedi & Associates for Respondent no.2.
Mr. P.A. Pol APP for State.

CORAM; A.P. DESHPANDE, J.
DATED; 11TH DECEMBER, 2007

P.C.;

1. In view of the judgment of this Court in **V.K.Jain's case,** the learned counsel for the petitioner does not press the petition and seeks permission to withdraw the same with liberty to file revision under section 397 of Cr.P.C. before the Sessions Court. Permission granted as prayed for. Writ Petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

2, At this stage the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the time spent by the petitioner before this court in prosecuting the petition need to be excluded while counting the limitation for filing the revision. It is obvious that as the petitioner has been bonafidely prosecuting this petition in the High Court, time spent by him

would be excluded, if an appropriate application under the Limitation Act is filed along with the revision seeking condonation of delay.

3. The next request is for extension of ad-interim order for a period of four weeks so as to enable the petitioner to file the revision. The limited prayer is granted. Ad-interim order to continue for four weeks.

....